



County of Santa Cruz

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

701 OCEAN STREET, ROOM 410, SANTA CRUZ, CA 95060-4070
(831) 454-2160 FAX (831) 454-2385 TDD (831) 454-2123

THOMAS L. BOLICH
DIRECTOR OF PUBLIC WORKS

December 14, 2004

ROSARIO MARIN, CHAIR
California Integrated Waste Management Board
P.O. Box 2815
Sacramento, CA 95812-2815

SUBJECT: SANTA CRUZ COUNTY FIVE-YEAR PLAN REVIEW REPORT

Dear Ms. Marin:

The purpose of this letter is to convey, in accordance with California Code of Regulations Section 18788, comments from the Santa Cruz County Integrated Waste Management Local Task Force (Local Task Force) regarding the adequacy of the Santa Cruz County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (Plan) and the need for any revision to the Plan.

On December 2, 2004, the Local Task Force commented that no revisions to the Plan were required at this time and voted to approve the draft Five-Year Plan Review Report as presented.

If you have any questions regarding this letter, please do not hesitate to contact Dan deGrassi, staff to the Local Task Force, at the Santa Cruz County Department of Public Works, 831-454-3102.

Yours truly,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Scott Hamby".

Scott Hamby, Chair
Santa Cruz County Integrated
Waste Management Local Task Force

RPM:mh

Copy to: Santa Cruz County Integrated Waste Management Local Task Force
✓ Terry Edwards, California Integrated Waste Management Board

Syrplanmh

SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
COUNTYWIDE INTEGRATED WASTE MANAGEMENT PLAN
FIVE YEAR REVIEW REPORT

DECEMBER 10, 2004

PREPARED BY
SANTA CRUZ COUNTY
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| Section | Description | Page |
|----------------|----------------------------------|-------------|
| 1 | Introduction | 3 |
| 2 | Background | 5 |
| 3 | Local Task Force Review | 6 |
| 4 | Issues Analysis | 7 |
| 5 | Summary of Findings | 16 |
| 6 | Supplementary Information | 17 |

SECTION 1 **INTRODUCTION**

The California Integrated Waste Management Act of 1989 (Assembly Bill 939) requires cities and counties in California to reduce the amount of solid waste disposed in landfills and transformed by 25% by 1995; by 50% by the year 2000 through source reduction, recycling, and composting activities. The Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan (CIWMP) is the guiding document for attaining these goals.

The California Public Resources Code (PRC) Section 41822 requires each city and county to review its Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) or the CIWMP at least once every five years to:

- (1) Correct any deficiencies in the element or plan;
- (2) Comply with the source reduction and recycling requirements established under PRC Section 41780; and
- (3) Revise the documents, as necessary.

California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788 states that prior to the fifth anniversary of Board approval of the CIWMP, the Local Task Force (LTF) shall complete a review of the CIWMP to assure that the County's waste management practices remain consistent with the hierarchy of waste management practices defined in PRC Section 40051.

The hierarchy stated in PRC 40051 is:

- (1) Source reduction;
- (2) Recycling and composting;
- (3) Environmentally safe transformation and environmentally safe land disposal.

The process identified in CCR 18788 is summarized as follows:

- ☐ Prior to the 5th anniversary, the LTF shall submit *written comments* on areas of the CIWMP, which require revision to the county and the Board;
- ☐ Within 45 days of receipt of comments, the county shall determine if a revision is necessary and notify the LTF and the Board of its findings in a *CIWMP Review Report*; and
- ☐ within 90 days of receipt of the *CIWMP Review Report*, the Board shall review the county's findings and, at a public hearing, approve or disapprove the county's findings.

CCR 18788 also identifies the minimum issues, which are to be addressed in the *CIWMP Review Report*. They are:

- (A) Changes in demographics in the county;
- (B) Changes in quantities of the waste within the county;

- (C) Changes in funding sources for administration of the countywide siting element and summary plan;
- (D) Changes in administrative responsibilities;
- (E) Program implementation status;
- (F) Changes in permitted disposal capacity and quantities of waste disposed of in the County;
- (G) Changes in available markets for recyclable materials; and
- (H) Changes in the implementation schedule.

The California Integrated Waste Management Board (Board) clarified the five-year CIWMP review process in CCR Section 18788. On October 30, 1998 and again on July 21, 2000, the CIWMB Office of Local Assistance sent letters to jurisdictions clarifying the Board's oversight of the five year revision process. A copy of CCR Section 18788 is included in Section 6 of this *CIWMP Review Report*.

The July 21st letter stated that the five year anniversary is from the date of final approval by the Board of the CIWMP; that the Board Legal staff determined that jurisdictions can utilize their annual reports to update program information, if a revision is not determined by the jurisdiction to be necessary; and that if a revision is determined to be necessary, it may be submitted with the next annual report.

ABBREVIATIONS USED IN THIS REPORT

| | |
|-------|---|
| CCR | California Code of Regulations |
| CIWMB | California Integrated Waste Management Board |
| CIWMP | Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan |
| CPI | Consumer Price Index |
| CSE | Countywide Siting Element |
| HHWE | Household Hazardous Waste Element |
| LTF | Local Task Force |
| NDFE | Non-Disposal Facility Element |
| PARIS | Planning and Annual Report Information System |
| PRC | Public Resources Code |
| SP | Summary Plan |
| SRRE | Source Reduction and Recycling Element |

SECTION 2 **BACKGROUND**

The Santa Cruz County Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan contains solid waste planning documents for the County of Santa Cruz and the incorporated cities of Capitola, Santa Cruz, Scotts Valley and Watsonville.

These documents include:

- ☐ Source Reduction and Recycling Elements (SRREs) for each city and the county named above;
- ☐ Household Hazardous Waste Elements (HHWEs) for each city and the county named above.
- ☐ The Non-disposal Facility Elements (NDFE) for each city and the county named above.
- ☐ Countywide Siting Element (CSE)
- ☐ Summary Plan (SP)

The California Integrated Waste Management Board gave final approval for the Countywide Integrated Waste Management Plan for the County of Santa Cruz and its cities in March 1999. This is the county's first 5-Year Review Report since the approval of the CIWMP.

The purpose of this *CIWMP Review Report* therefore is to document the compliance of PRC 41822 and CCR 18788 by Santa Cruz County and its four cities.

Each jurisdiction in the county- the City of Capitola, City of Santa Cruz, City of Scotts Valley, City of Watsonville and Unincorporated County of Santa Cruz, has a diversion requirement of 50% for 2000 and each year thereafter. No petition for a reduction in to the 50% requirement or time extension has been requested by any of the jurisdictions.

SECTION 3 **LOCAL TASK FORCE REVIEW**

The Santa Cruz County Integrated Waste Management Local Task Force (LTF) includes the following members:

| Name (Rep. / Alt.) | Representative Of (e.g., City or County) |
|-----------------------------------|---|
| Sheryl Ainsworth / Scott Hamby | City of Scotts Valley |
| Richard De La Paz / Robert Ketley | City of Watsonville |
| Stephanie Harlan / Lisa Murphy | City of Capitola |
| David Koch / Nancy Lockwood | City of Watsonville |
| Bob Nelson / Mary Arman | City of Santa Cruz |
| Ellen Pirie / Robin Musitelli | County of Santa Cruz |
| Norm Ploss / Michael Bethke | County of Santa Cruz |
| Michael Rotkin / Alan Schlenger | City of Santa Cruz |
| Mardi Wormhoudt / Andy Schiffrin | County of Santa Cruz |

In accordance with Title 14 CCR, Section 18788, the LTF reviewed each element and plan included in the CIWMP and finalized its comments at the December 2, 2004 LTF meeting.

The Santa Cruz County Integrated Waste Management Local Task Force had no comments on the CIWMP other than to conclude that no revision was necessary. The Task Force took action to approve the draft Plan Review Report as presented.

The county received these comments from the LTF on December 2, 2004, beginning the 45-day period for submitting the 5-Year CIWMP Review Report to the CIWMB and the LTF.

SECTION 4**ISSUES ANALYSIS**

This section addresses not only the areas of change specified in the California Code of Regulations (CCR) Section 18788 (3) (A) through (H), but also provide specific analysis regarding the continued adequacy the planning documents in light of those changes, including a determination as to whether each necessitates a revision to one or more of the planning documents.

Section 4.1 Changes in Demographics in the County

The following tables document the demographic changes in the county since 1990. The analysis addresses the adequacy of the planning documents in light of these changes and the need, if any, for revision.

As can be seen from Table 1, the residential/non-residential generation percentages have not changed significantly since the preparation of the planning documents. Figures in the "Old" column reflect 1990 and those in the "New" column, the year 2000.

Table 1. Sources of Generation

| JURISDICTION | RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE | | NON-RESIDENTIAL PERCENTAGE | |
|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|------------|---------------------------------------|------------|
| | OLD | NEW | OLD | NEW |
| City of Capitola | n/a | 41 | n/a | 59 |
| City of Santa Cruz | 46 | 52 | 54 | 48 |
| City of Scotts Valley | 15 | 15 | 85 | 85 |
| City of Watsonville | 39 | 39 | 61 | 61 |
| Unincorporated County | 34 | 38 | 66 | 62 |

Sources: CIWMB, <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/MARS/JurDrSta.asp?VW=In> (Report Years: 1995, 1998, 2002)

Table 2 on the following page shows population growth for the ten-year period from 1990 to 2000. Each jurisdiction has kept pace with its population growth through expansion of solid waste management services, including recycling and other diversion programs. Employment, taxable sales and the CPI increases reflect the "dot com" boom of the late 1990s (which crashed shortly thereafter). These changes have been accounted for in the CIWMB adjustment methodology utilized to calculate the individual diversion rates.

Table 2. Demographics

| POPULATION | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Population For Each Jurisdiction | 1990 | 2000 | % Change |
| City of Capitola Population | 10,171 | 10,033 | -1.4 |
| City of Santa Cruz Population | 49,040 | 54,593 | 11.3 |
| City of Scotts Valley Population | 8,615 | 11,385 | 32.2 |
| City of Watsonville Population | 31,099 | 44,265 | 42.3 |
| Unincorporated County Population | 130,809 | 135,326 | 3.5 |
| Countywide Population | 229,734 | 255,602 | 11.3 |

| EMPLOYMENT | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Employment Factor For Each Jurisdiction | 1990 | 2000 | % Change |
| Countywide Employment | 126,800 | 135,100 | 6.5 |

| TAXABLE SALES TRANSACTIONS | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Taxable Sales Factor For Each Jurisdiction | 1990 | 2000 | % Change |
| City of Capitola Taxable Sales | 303,753 | 463,310 | 52.5 |
| City of Santa Cruz Taxable Sales | 480,315 | 828,500 | 72.5 |
| City of Scotts Valley Taxable Sales | 138,614 | 184,736 | 33.3 |
| City of Watsonville Taxable Sales | 284,337 | 445,077 | 56.5 |
| Unincorporated County Taxable Sales | 442,424 | 706,494 | 59.7 |
| Countywide Taxable Sales Transactions | 1,649,443 | 2,628,117 | 59.3 |

| Consumer Price Index | | | |
|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------|-----------------|
| Statewide Consumer Price Index | 1990 | 2000 | % Change |
| | 135 | 174.8 | 29.5 |

Source: CIWMB Default Adjustment Factors
(<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/DivMeasure/JuAdjFac.asp>)

Table 3 below shows changes in the number of dwelling units in the various jurisdictions of Santa Cruz County from 1990 to 2000. Scotts Valley showed the largest increase in single family homes for this period, followed by Watsonville. Capitola and the Unincorporated County showed a decline in the number of multi-family dwellings while the other three jurisdictions had a modest increase in such units.

Table 3. Dwelling Information

| Jurisdiction | 1990 Single Family Dwellings | 2000 Single Family Dwellings | % Change | 1990 Multi- Family Dwellings | 2000 Multi- Family Dwellings | % Change | 1990 Mobile Homes | 2000 Mobile Homes | % Change |
|---------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|---------------------------------------|---------------------------------------|-------------|-------------------------|-------------------------|-------------|
| Capitola | 2282 | 2246 | -1.6 | 2229 | 2213 | -0.7 | 771 | 650 | -15.7 |
| Santa Cruz | 12,718 | 14,008 | 10.1 | 6240 | 7056 | 13.1 | 406 | 440 | 8.4 |
| Scotts Valley | 2100 | 2831 | 34.8 | 675 | 788 | 16.7 | 797 | 804 | 0.9 |
| Watsonville | 6320 | 7524 | 19.1 | 2832 | 3293 | 16.3 | 757 | 872 | 15.2 |
| Uninc County | 42,272 | 44,686 | 5.7 | 7053 | 6776 | -3.9 | 4426 | 4486 | 1.4 |

Source: <http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/E-5.xls>;
<http://www.dof.ca.gov/HTML/DEMOGRAP/E-5a.xls>

Analysis

These demographic changes do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents. The basis for this determination is provided below.

The increases in population and housing naturally result in additional generation of solid waste. Diversion programs of all five jurisdictions have been able to expand to meet this growth. Disposal facilities have adequate capacity to accommodate materials destined for landfill disposal. These increases and their resulting impacts on the solid waste management systems described in the CIWMP have been entirely manageable and the Plan remains adequate in its documentation of the waste management strategies used in Santa Cruz County.

Section 4.2 Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County and Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Waste Disposed in the County

1. Changes in Quantities of Waste within the County (as it relates to diversion program implementation)

The data below document changes in reported disposal compared to original Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) projections. Additionally, the Biennial Review findings for each jurisdiction are provided in Table 6 below to demonstrate progress in implementing the SRRE and achieving diversion mandates. The analysis at the end of this section addresses how these changes are being addressed (e.g., how existing, new or planned programs deal with the reported changes in the quantities of waste) relative to the jurisdictions' ability to meet and maintain the diversion goal and the need, if any, for a revision to one or more of the planning documents.

Generation

The table below shows the average amount of waste generated within Santa Cruz County described in terms of pounds per person per day.

Table 4. Per Capita Generation

| | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
|---------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Capitola | 11.9 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 12.0 | 12.3 | 12.2 | 11.9 |
| Santa Cruz | 12.5 | 11.7 | 11.9 | 12.3 | 12.4 | 12.8 | 13.5 | 13.3 | 12.6 |
| Scotts Valley | 18.7 | 17.4 | 17.0 | 16.1 | 16.1 | 16.2 | 16.8 | 16.8 | 16.1 |
| Watsonville | 9.2 | 6.6 | 6.2 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 15.0 | 14.6 | 15.2 | 15.0 |
| Uninc. County | 8.7 | 5.3 | 5.4 | 5.6 | 5.7 | 8.5 | 8.9 | 8.9 | 8.6 |
| Countywide | 10.1 | n/a | n/a | n/a | n/a | 11.0 | 11.4 | 11.5 | 11.1 |
| Statewide | 9.3 | 8.6 | 8.8 | 8.9 | 9.4 | 9.9 | 10.7 | 10.8 | 11.2 |

Sources: CIWMB Board Approved Diversion Rate Reports; Department of Finance Population Reports. Figures for Capitola for the years 1995-1998 are not available from that source.

By and large, generation rates have remained steady over this twelve-year period with Watsonville and the County showing increases in the late 1990s, reflecting the economic growth at that time. The Countywide average has also remained more or less aligned with the statewide average over the period.

Disposal

The following table provides disposal data for the county from the Solid Waste Generation Study (1990) and each jurisdiction's Annual Reports (1995 through 2002). The 1990 figures for Capitola and Scotts Valley may not be accurate as there was some question about the origin studies conducted at the time. Neither city undertook major diversion programs between 1990 and 1995 that resulted in a fifty percent plus reduction in their waste stream.

Table 5. Disposal Totals (Tons)

| Year | 1990 | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
|------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|
| Capitola | 31,384 | 14,801 | 12,325 | 12,018 | 11,554 | 12,304 | 11,753 | 11,031 | 10,842 |
| Santa Cruz | 77,069 | 72,076 | 72,546 | 75,604 | 71,549 | 69,477 | 81,106 | 70,791 | 60,922 |
| Scotts Valley | 28,260 | 14,033 | 12,284 | 11,549 | 14,609 | 13,764 | 12,691 | 11,536 | 11,836 |
| Watsonville | 40,940 | 33,648 | 33,756 | 34,068 | 39,642 | 40,269 | 42,423 | 36,761 | 36,097 |
| Uninc. County | 111,087 | 101,799 | 105,544 | 106,945 | 112,603 | 113,109 | 121,726 | 116,836 | 120,810 |
| Countywide | 288,740 | 236,357 | 236,455 | 240,184 | 249,957 | 249,923 | 269,699 | 246,955 | 240,507 |

Sources: *CIWMB Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover Tons by Facility*
<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/JurDspFa.asp>, *Single-year Countywide Origin*
Detail at <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/Origin/WFOrgin.asp>

Table 6. Comparison of SRRE-2000 Projected Disposal Tonnage vs. 2000 Disposal Totals

The following table is a comparison of the SRRE-projected disposal tonnage to the actual 2000 disposal tonnage reported for each jurisdiction.

| Jurisdiction | SRRE 2000 Projected | Disposal 2000 Reported | % Difference |
|-----------------------|------------------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| City of Capitola | 19,537 | 11,753 | -39.8 |
| City of Santa Cruz | 60,843 | 81,106 | 33.3 |
| City of Scotts Valley | 13,558 | 12,691 | -6.4 |
| City of Watsonville | 24,742 | 42,423 | 71.5 |
| Unincorporated County | 36,146 | 121,726 | 236.8 |
| Countywide | 154,826 | 269,699 | 74.2 |

Sources: *CIWMB Jurisdiction Disposal and Alternative Daily Cover Tons by Facility*
<http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/JurDspFa.asp>, *Single-year Countywide Origin*
Detail <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGCentral/drs/reports/Origin/WFOrgin.asp>

The cities of Capitola and Scotts Valley show a lower actual disposal quantity for 2000 than was projected in 1990 by their Source Reduction and Recycling Elements. The other three jurisdictions show a higher quantity. There are several reasons for these latter differences. First, the SRRE projections were based on diversion program performance which in some cases assumed very optimistic diversion amounts. Source reduction is one general example. Second, some programs for various reasons were not implemented, or started later than anticipated and these changes have been reflected in the Annual Reports. The most significant case is the Unincorporated County, the SRRE for which identified a four-sort recycling/composting program that was to yield an 84% diversion rate. This program, whose assumed level of diversion was questioned from the start, was

not implemented due to cost. A number of other diversion programs were put into effect instead and these have yielded over a fifty percent diversion rate for the County. The same circumstances, in general, apply to the cities of Santa Cruz and Watsonville. What is more important than the numbers themselves is the fact that none of the jurisdictions have had to deviate in any major way from their planned use of disposal or diversion facilities or strategies and all have successfully reached the 2000 diversion mandate.

Diversion

The Biennial Review findings for the county and associated cities are listed in Table 7 to demonstrate each jurisdiction's progress in implementing its SRRE and achieving the mandated diversion requirements. Additionally, following these data is an explanation of any significant changes in diversion rate trends (e.g., report year tonnage modification, new or corrected Solid Waste Generation Study, newly implemented programs).

Table 7. Biennial Review Data for Santa Cruz County Jurisdictions (1990 to 2002)

| | | 1995 | 1996 | 1997 | 1998 | 1999 | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 |
|---------------|------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|-----------------------------------|----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|
| Capitola | Diversion Rate | No Rate | No Rate | No Rate | No Rate | 44% | 48% | 51% | 51% |
| | Biennial Review Status | Compliance Fulfilled | Compliance Fulfilled | Board Accepted | Board Accepted | Board Approved Good Faith Effort | Board Approved Good Faith Effort | Board Approved | Board Approved |
| Santa Cruz | Diversion Rate | 35% | 36% | 36% | 41% | 47% | 48% | 48% | 52% |
| | Biennial Review Status | Board Approved | Board Approved | Board Approved | Board Approved | Board Approved Good Faith Effort | Board Approved Good Faith Effort | Board Approved | Board Approved |
| Scotts Valley | Diversion Rate | 59% | 62% | 64% | 55% | 59% | 64% | 67% | 65% |
| | Biennial Review Status | Board Approved | Board Approved | Board Approved | Board Approved | Board Approved | Board Approved | Board Approved | Board Approved |
| Watsonville | Diversion Rate | 25% | 26% | 35% | 32% | 67% | 66% | 72% | 72% |
| | Biennial Review Status | Board Approved | Board Approved | Board Accepted | Board Accepted | Board Approved with New Base Year | Board Approved | Board Approved | Board Approved |
| Uninc. County | Diversion Rate | 21% | 20% | 21% | 19% | 46% | 50% | 55% | 51% |
| | Biennial Review Status | Board Approved Good Faith Effort | Board Approved Good Faith Effort | Board Accepted | Board Accepted | Board Approved | Board Approved | Board Approved | Board Approved |

Source: CIWMB Countywide, Regionwide and Statewide Jurisdiction Diversion Progress Report ; <http://www.ciwmb.ca.gov/LGTools/MARS/jurdrsta.asp>

While not noted in the above CIWMB database, the City of Capitola and the County of Santa Cruz each had a New Base Year approved by the CIWMB in 1999. In both cases, and as with the City of Watsonville also, these jurisdictions documented existing additional diversion that was not identified in the original waste generation studies prepared in 1990. As of 2002, all five jurisdictions are exceeding the state 50% disposal reduction mandate.

A review of the preceding waste generation, disposal and diversion data indicates that the changes in quantities of waste, as they relate to meeting and maintaining the mandated diversion goals do not warrant a revision to any of the countywide planning documents. The diversion facilities identified in each jurisdiction's Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE) and in subsequent Annual Reports and NDFE amendments are adequate to meet the changing and increasing quantities of waste generated in the county.

At the time of the preparation of this Five-Year Plan Review Report, the County of Santa Cruz is preparing an amendment to its Non-Disposal Facility Element to identify two yard waste/wood waste chipping and grinding facilities, a Construction and Demolition Waste Recycling Facility and a Research Compost Operation, all of which contribute to the County's diversion strategy.

2. Changes in Permitted Disposal Capacity and Quantities of Waste Disposed in the County or Regional Agency

The following addresses whether changes in permitted disposal capacity and waste quantities (both imported from out of county and generated in the county) affect the county's ability to maintain 15 years of disposal capacity and includes a determination regarding the need for planning document revision.

Despite the inaccuracy of the SRRE based disposal projections, more than 15 years of countywide disposal capacity remains. This is documented in Table 8., below. Nonetheless, in compliance with the Countywide CIWMP, the county and four cities have initiated a study to identify future disposal or other solid waste management options. This study includes examination of the potential for a new landfill to serve all five jurisdictions, the potential for non-disposal alternatives such as waste-to-energy or conversion technologies and the potential for export of local waste out of the county and/or out of the state. This study will likely be completed in three or four years at which time any related NDFE or Countywide Siting Element amendment would be initiated. Until such time, the Countywide Siting Element remains accurate and adequate in describing needed disposal facilities.

Table 8. Remaining Disposal Capacity - Santa Cruz County Landfills

| SANTA CRUZ COUNTY PERMITTED LANDFILL DISPOSAL | | | | | |
|---|-------------------------------------|--|----------------------------------|--|--------------------------------------|
| | Estimated Closure Year (1) | Maximum Permitted Tonnage 2003 tpd | Actual Tonnage 2003 tpd | Remaining Capacity (yr) (1) mcy | Remaining Capacity 2004 mcy |
| COUNTY | 2019 | 759 | 384 | 6.3 (1999) | 4.0 |
| SANTA CRUZ | 2037 | 535 | 156 | 6.2 (2003) | 6.0 |
| WATSONVILLE | 2029 | 275 | 97 | 2.1 (2000) | 2.0 |
| tpd = tons per day mcy = million cubic yards 1200 lbs/cy | | | | | |
| Sources: CIWMB Solid Waste Facility Permits (1); Disposal Reporting System; Individual Jurisdiction Landfill Airspace Calculations | | | | | |

Tables 9 and 10 on the following pages provide a snapshot summary of solid waste management activity for Santa Cruz County for 2002 and 2003, the most recent years for which the respective CIWMB data is available. Table 9 shows the nature of the solid waste disposal activity in 2003 for solid waste generated by each of the five jurisdictions of Santa Cruz County. This table shows where that solid waste went for its final resting place. This includes both landfills within the county and out-of-county landfills. It should be noted that the accuracy of some of the numbers for out-of-county landfills are being questioned. Table 10 provides a summary of generation, diversion, disposal quantities for the year 2002 for each of the five jurisdictions in the county. On a countywide basis, for every two tons of solid waste disposed in a landfill, almost three tons were diverted.

TABLE 9. 2003 DISPOSAL - SANTA CRUZ COUNTY

(All figures in tons)

| | SANTA CRUZ | CAPITOLA | COUNTY | SCOTTS VALLEY | WATSONVILLE | COUNTYWIDE |
|------------------------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|----------------|
| TOTAL | 64,618 | 11,229 | 115,899 | 12,923 | 37,504 | 242,173 |
| TPD (365) | 177 | 31 | 318 | 35 | 103 | 663 |
| % of countywide total | 27% | 5% | 48% | 5% | 15% | 100% |

USE OF SANTA CRUZ COUNTY LANDFILLS BY JURISDICTION

LOCAL DISPOSAL ONLY (does not include refuse received from out-of-county)

| Facility Name | | | | | | Landfill Total |
|-------------------------------|--------|------|---------|--------|--------|----------------|
| COUNTY OF SANTA CRUZ LANDFILL | 7083 | 1862 | 114,996 | 11,808 | 1530 | 137,279 |
| % of landfill total | 5.2 | 1.4 | 83.8 | 8.6 | 1.1 | |
| CITY OF SANTA CRUZ LANDFILL | 56,385 | 0 | 33 | 0 | 0 | 56,418 |
| % of landfill total | 99.9 | 0.0 | 0.1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | |
| CITY OF WATSONVILLE LANDFILL | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 35,133 | 35,133 |
| % of landfill total | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 100 | |

USE OF OUT-OF COUNTY LANDFILLS BY JURISDICTION

| | | | | | | Countywide |
|----------------------------------|------|------|-----|------|-----|------------|
| tons sent out-of-county | 1150 | 9366 | 870 | 1114 | 842 | 13,342 |
| % of jurisdiction total disposal | 2 | 83 | 1 | 9 | 2 | 6 |

DISPOSAL IN ALL LANDFILLS including OUT-OF-COUNTY

| Facility Name (County) | | | | | | Countywide Total Disposal |
|---|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------|
| ALTAMONT LANDFILL - RESOURCE RECV'RY (Alameda) | 5 | 6 | | 0 | 235 | 246 |
| ARVIN SANITARY LANDFILL (Kern) | 12 | | | 2 | | 14 |
| AZUSA LAND RECLAMATION CO, INC (Los Angeles) | 130 | 14 | 22 | | 14 | 180 |
| B - J DROPBOX SANITARY LANDFILL (Solano) | | 4 | 35 | | 3 | 42 |
| BAKERSFIELD S.L.F. (BENA) (Kern) | 7 | | | 1 | | 8 |
| BUENA VISTA DRIVE SANITARY LANDFILL (Santa Cruz) | 7,083 | 1,862 | 114,996 | 11,808 | 1,530 | 137,279 |
| CITY OF SANTA CRUZ SANITARY LANDFILL (Santa Cruz) | 56,385 | | 33 | | | 56,418 |
| CITY OF WATSONVILLE LANDFILL (Santa Cruz) | | | | | 35,133 | 35,133 |
| CRAZY HORSE SANITARY LANDFILL (Monterey) | | | 27 | | 120 | 147 |
| CWMI - B18 Nonhazardous Codisposal (Kings Waste and Recycling Authority) | 3 | | | | 2 | 5 |
| FORWARD, INC (San Joaquin) | 18 | | | | 5 | 23 |
| GUADALUPE SANITARY LANDFILL (Santa Clara) | 5 | | | 62 | | 67 |
| JOHN SMITH Road Landfill (San Benito County Int Waste Mgmt Regional Agency) | | | 2 | | | 2 |
| MONTEREY REGIONAL WST MGMT DST/MARINA LF (Monterey) | 775 | 9,342 | 777 | 1,046 | 459 | 12,399 |
| NEWBY ISLAND SANITARY LANDFILL (Santa Clara) | 51 | | | | 4 | 55 |
| OX MOUNTAIN SANITARY LANDFILL (San Mateo) | 11 | | | | | 11 |
| PACHECO PASS SANITARY LANDFILL (Santa Clara) | | | 7 | | | 7 |
| POTRERO HILLS LANDFILL (Solano) | 49 | | | 3 | | 52 |
| ZANKER Material Processing Facility (Santa Clara) | 80 | | | | | 80 |
| ZANKER ROAD CLASS III LANDFILL (Santa Clara) | 4 | | | | | 4 |
| Totals (Tons) | 64,618 | 11,229 | 115,899 | 12,923 | 37,504 | 242,173 |

Source: CIWMB Disposal Reporting System

TABLE 10. SANTA CRUZ COUNTY 2002 GENERATION - DIVERSION - DISPOSAL

| | GENERATION | | DIVERSION | | DISPOSAL | | DIVERSION RATE |
|--|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|-------------|----------------|
| TOTALS (tons) | | | | | | | |
| County | 211,693 | | 108,679 | | 103,014 | | 51% |
| Santa Cruz | 127,797 | | 66,875 | | 60,922 | | 52% |
| Watsonville | 129,872 | | 93,775 | | 36,097 | | 72% |
| Scotts Valley | 34,180 | | 22,344 | | 11,836 | | 65% |
| Capitola | 21,951 | | 11,109 | | 10,842 | | 51% |
| Countywide | 525,493 | | 302,782 | | 222,711 | | 58% |
| | | | | | | | |
| Annual Per Person | tons | lbs | tons | lbs | tons | lbs | |
| County | 1.58 | 3153 | 0.81 | 1618 | 0.77 | 1534 | |
| Santa Cruz | 2.31 | 4614 | 1.21 | 2414 | 1.10 | 2199 | |
| Watsonville | 2.73 | 5468 | 1.97 | 3948 | 0.76 | 1520 | |
| Scotts Valley | 2.95 | 5893 | 1.93 | 3852 | 1.02 | 2041 | |
| Capitola | 2.17 | 4347 | 1.10 | 2200 | 1.07 | 2147 | |
| Countywide | 2.03 | 4059 | 1.17 | 2339 | 0.86 | 1720 | |
| | | | | | | | |
| Pounds Per Person Per Day (365) | | | | | | | |
| County | | 8.6 | | 4.4 | | 4.2 | |
| Santa Cruz | | 12.6 | | 6.6 | | 6.0 | |
| Watsonville | | 15.0 | | 10.8 | | 4.2 | |
| Scotts Valley | | 16.1 | | 10.6 | | 5.6 | |
| Capitola | | 11.9 | | 6.0 | | 5.9 | |
| Countywide | | 11.1 | | 6.4 | | 4.7 | |

Source: CIWMB Diversion Rate Reports

Section 4.3 Changes in Funding Source for Administration of the Countywide Siting Element (CSE) and Summary Plan (SP)

The County of Santa Cruz is responsible for administering the Countywide Siting Element and the Summary Plan. Fulfillment of this responsibility is accomplished through the Santa Cruz Department of Public Works Recycling and Solid Waste Division. Funding for this activity comes from County Service Area 9C. There have been no changes in the funding source for administration of the CSE and SP.

Section 4.4 Changes in Administrative Responsibilities

The County of Santa Cruz is responsible for administering the Countywide Siting Element and the Summary Plan. Fulfillment of this responsibility is accomplished through the Santa Cruz Department of Public Works Recycling and Solid Waste Division. There have been no changes in this administration of the CSE and SP.

Section 4.5 Programs that Were Scheduled to Be Implemented But Were Not

1. Progress of Program Implementation

a. Source Reduction and Recycling Element (SRRE) and Household Hazardous Waste Element (HHWE)

All program implementation information has been updated in the CIWMB Planning and Reporting Information System (PARIS), including the reason for not implementing programs, if applicable. In particular, the PARIS notes provide detail on the status of program progress for each jurisdiction.

b. Non-Disposal Facility Element (NDFE)

The City of Watsonville amended its NDFE in 2004 to reflect a new diversion facility. The County of Santa Cruz is preparing an amendment to its NDFE to reflect two existing and two new diversion facilities. These facilities include a Chipping & Grinding Operation at the Ben Lomond Transfer Station and at the Buena Vista Landfill (both existing), a C & D Recycling Operation at the Buena Vista Landfill and a Research Composting Operation at the Buena Vista Landfill for food waste composting. This amendment will go to the Local Task Force for review and comment the first week of February 2005. Other than this, there have been no changes in the use of non-disposal facilities.

c. Countywide Siting Element (CSE)

There have been no changes to the information provided in the current Countywide Siting Element.

d. Summary Plan (SP)

There have been no changes to the information provided in the current Summary Plan.

2. Statement regarding whether Programs are Meeting Their Goals

The SRRE and HHWE programs are meeting their goals as evidenced by each jurisdiction in the county having exceeded the 50% disposal reduction mandate.

4.6 Changes in Available Markets for Recyclable Materials

There have been no changes in the availability of markets available to the jurisdictions of Santa Cruz County for their recyclable materials.

programs that were implemented, a statement as to whether programs are meeting their goals, and if not what contingency measures are being enacted to ensure compliance with Public Resources Code section 41751;

(F) changes in permitted disposal capacity, and quantities of waste disposed of in the county or regional agency;

(G) changes in available markets for recyclable materials; and

(H) changes in the implementation schedule.

(4) Within 90 days of receipt of the CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report, the Board shall review the county's or regional agency's findings, and at a public hearing, approve or disapprove the county's or regional agency's findings. Within 30 days of its action, the Board shall send a copy of its resolution, approving or disapproving the county's or regional agency's findings, to the LTF and the county or regional agency. If the Board has identified additional areas that require revision, the Board shall identify those areas in its resolution.

(b) CIWMP or RAIWMP Revision. If a revision is necessary the county or regional agency shall submit a CIWMP or RAIWMP revision schedule to the Board.

(1) The county or regional agency shall revise the CIWMP or RAIWMP in the areas noted as deficient in the CIWMP or RAIWMP Review Report and/or as identified by the Board.

(2) The county or regional agency shall revise and resubmit its CIWMP or RAIWMP pursuant to the requirements of sections 18780 through 18784 of this article.

(c) The county shall submit all revisions of its CIWMP to the Board for approval. The revised CIWMP shall be reviewed pursuant to the requirements of sections 18784 through 18786 of this article.

(d) The regional agency shall submit all revisions of its RAIWMP to the Board for approval. The revised RAIWMP shall be reviewed pursuant to the requirements of sections 18784 through 18786 of this article.

Note:

Authority:

Section 40502 of the Public Resources Code.

Reference:

Sections 40051, 40052, 41750, 41760, 41770, and 41822 of the Public Resources Code.